

REMARKS

In the June 24, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-19 were pending in the application and were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kanno (US 5,602,567) in view of Yoshinobu (US 5,699,104). Claims 20 and 21 have been added and thus, claims 1-21 remain in the case. The Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed below.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a "display control unit transmitting a control signal for changing the operation mode of the main apparatus into a low power consumption mode under a predetermined condition" (claim 1, last 4 lines) as described in the specification at least at page 12, line 20 to page 13, line 7 and page 14, lines 12-15. In contrast, while Kanno teaches a video display monitor, the Office Action admitted that "Kanno does not teach a screen protecting data in the memory" (Office Action, page 2, line 17). Furthermore, Yoshinobu is directed to "[a] screen saver ... incorporated as a part of ... [a] locking device for limiting the video reception" (Yoshinobu, Abstract, lines 7-8). Nothing has been cited or found in Kanno and Yoshinobu that teaches or suggests a "low power consumption" mode of operation that is initiated by a display control unit as now recited in claim 1. Thus, nothing has been cited or found in Kanno and Yoshinobu either considered together or taken individually that teaches or suggests each limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Kanno and Yoshinobu.

Independent claims 4, 6, 9, 10 and 14 recite "low power consumption" limitations in a manner similar to the limitation quoted above from claim 1. Thus, claims 4, 6, 9, 10 and 14 are allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11-13 and 15-19, which depend from claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 14 distinguish over the applied art for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

New Claims

Newly added independent claim 20 recites "a display controller ... transmitting a control signal to the data processing device to place the data processing device in an energy saver mode under a predetermined condition" (claim 20, last 4 lines). As a result, it is submitted that claim 20, and claim 21 which depends from claim 20, patentably distinguish over Kanno and Yoshinobu for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-21 are in condition suitable for allowance. Entry of the Amendment, reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Preliminary Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9/26/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on September 26, 2005
STAAS & HALSEY
By: JOHN L. YOUNG
Date: SEPTEMBER 26, 2005